HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL
Writ Petition No. 253 (M/S) of 2006
With
Stay Application No. 3070/06

1. Dr. Sareveshawar Prasad Raturi
S/o Late Sri Geeta Ram Raturi
Resident of Mishra Bhawan, Near Krishi
Bhawan Srinagar Road, Pauri
District-Pauri Garhwal.
On behalf of his minor Daughter Kumari
Anuradha Raturi.
2. Pushkar Singh Rawat S/o Late Sri T.S. Rawat
Resident of P.N.B. Building Dhara Road Pauri
District- Pauri Garhwal on behalf of his minor
Daughter Kumar Srishti Rawat. …Petitioners

Vs

1. State of Uttaranchal through Secretary Education
Secretariat, Subhash Road, Dehradun.
2. District Education Officer, Pauri,
District- Pauri Garhwal.
3. Uttaranchal Intermediate and High School
Education Board through Additional Secretary,
Uttaranchal Examination Council, Ramnagar,
District-Nainital, Uttaranchal. …Respondents

Sri Atul Bahuguna learned counsel for the petitioners
Sri V.K. Bist learned Senior Advocate assisted by
Sri Ambrish Chatterjee learned counsel for the respondent No.3
Sri Nand Prasad learned Standing Counsel for the respondent No.1 and 2.

Dated: 22-3-2006

Hon'ble B.S. Verma, J.

Heard Sri Atul Bahuguna learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri V.K. Bist, Senior Advocate assisted by Sri Ambrish Chatterjee learned counsel for the respondent No. 3 and Sri Nand Prasad learned Standing counsel for the respondent No.s 1 and 2.

The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner with a prayer for issuing a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to issue the computerized Mark Sheet to the daughter of petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners have stated that they made an oral request to the principal but the principal had not issued computerized mark sheet.

The petitioners may make a representation to the respondent No.3 to redress his grievance. If the petitioners make a representation to the respondent No.3, the same may be decided by the respondent No.3 within four weeks from date of production of the certified copy of the order.

The petitioners have also prayed for revaluate, recheck or recount and scrutinize the subject of Social Science and Science.

Learned counsel for the respondent No.3 has stated that scrutiny has already been done by the Board. As far as the re-evaluation is concerned that is not permissible under the Rules. The petition is devoid of merit.

With the said observation the writ petition is dismissed.

(B.S. Verma,J)

Dated: 22-3-2006
M.K.